

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, the Examiner requested a new set of drawings of Figs. 1-4. A new set of drawings of Figs. 1-4 is enclosed with the instant response.

In item 4 on page 2 of the Office action, claims 10-20 have been rejected as being obvious over *Flickinger et al.* (US 6,517,382) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The above-noted rejection and the Examiner's comments have been considered. However, as will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome *Flickinger et al.*.

Applicants stated in the response dated July 31, 2003, that the inventive concept of the present invention of using a "pressing spring having a length and a width that tapers" is explained on page 10, lines 1-9, of the instant application, which states:

Given the same plate thickness and the same leg height, the restoring force or ejecting force provided by the restoring springs 71, 72 is in this case greater in the region of the wall 21 of the housing than when the rectangular pressing springs are used. This is to do with the fact that there is an approximately equal bending stress of the spring material in every cross section of the spring on account of the decreasing width of the springs in the direction of the interior of the housing.

In the *Response to Arguments*, on page 5 of the Office action, the Examiner stated that:

Regarding the rejection based on Flickinger, Applicant states that the reference provides no disclosure or suggestion of using a pressing spring having a length and a width that tapers for obtaining a greater prestress. The contact springs shown in the reference inherently create a prestress opposite a direction of insertion opposing insertion of said component, which is the only limitation concerning the prestress required by the claim. Furthermore, as noted in the above rejection, **those skilled in the art would recognize that modifying the contact springs so that they are angled or tapered would provide the contact springs with more resiliency for better contact** between the contact springs and their intended contact device for more reliable grounding and shielding. It is not necessary to show that the contact springs were modified for obtaining a greater prestress as in the present invention. It is only required that a motivation is provided for modifying the contact springs as noted above.

(Emphasis added.)

The Examiner offered no factual support or made no *Official Notice* why a person skilled in the art would recognize that angled or tapered contact springs would provide the contact springs with greater prestress in the context of the present invention.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness by combining reference teachings, MPEP § 2143 requires that:

- there must be **some suggestion or motivation** to combine the references in the prior art;

- there must be a **reasonable expectation of success** to be found in the prior art; and
- the combined prior art references must teach or suggest **all** the claim limitations.

Applicants believe that there is no **suggestion or motivation** in the applied references or for a person skilled in the art, for using a "pressing spring having a length and a width that tapers" for obtaining a greater prestress in the context of the present invention.

The Examiner is requested to show Applicants where the required motivation for using such a structure is found in the prior art. Indeed, Applicants believe that it is only teaching of the instant application that teaches such a structure.

It is therefore believed that the Examiner has not satisfied the criteria for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, as required by MPEP § 2143.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that *Flickinger et al.* do not suggest the features of claim 10. Claim 10 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and because claims 11-20 are ultimately dependent on claim 10, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Counsel so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 10-20 are solicited.

If an extension of time is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



Markus Nolf (Reg. No. 37,006)

January 9, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101